

CONCLUSION

Applicant's attorney wishes to thank Examiner Bekker for the telephone interview on August 27, 2009.

Claims 21, 22, 30, and 31 are now in the case. These claims are supported by applicant's U.S Patent Application Publication 2007/0098867 A1. Claims 21 and 30 have been amended to remove the broad language which the Examiner found objectionable. Claim 22 depends from Claim 21. Claims 21, 22, 30, and 31 are not obvious in view of the references. Applicant's all powdered sweetener with no aftertaste is not taught by the references, taken singly or in combination. There is no bulk sweetener in applicant's claims, as required by the main reference Nestelle. As indicated by the Examiner, the Terminal Disclaimer as per 37 CFR 1.321 (c) submitted should overcome the Double Patenting rejection of the claims. Reconsideration and allowance of Claims 21, 22, 30, and 31 are respectfully requested.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in the case.

Respectfully submitted,



Albert Brent
Reg. No. 18,459
Attorney For Applicant